



Kompetanse

på globalt
samarbeid

Competence in Global Co-operation
Compétence en Coopération Global-

www.sik.no

THE ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT IN THE DEVELOPMENT SECTOR IN MADAGASCAR LUTHERAN CHURCH (MLC)

Project review April 2006

Agnès RANDRIAMANANTSOA
Sigurd HAUS
Gilbert Solofon RANDRIANIRINA

SIK-rapport 2006:6



Senter for interkulturell kommunikasjon
Centre for Intercultural Communication
Centre pour la Communication Interculturelle

THE ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT IN THE DEVELOPMENT SECTOR IN MADAGASCAR LUTHERAN CHURCH (MLC)

Project review April 2006

Agnès RANDRIAMANANTSOA
Sigurd HAUS
Gilbert Solofon RANDRIANIRINA

SIK-rapport 2006:6



Senter for Interkulturell Kommunikasjon

Misjonsv. 34, 4024 Stavanger, Norway

Phone (+47) 51 51 62 74 Fax (+47) 51 51 62 72

Homepage: <http://www.sik.no>

ISBN: 82-7721-106-6	Title: ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT IN THE DEVELOPMENT SECTOR IN MADAGASCAR LUTHERAN CHURCH (MLC) Project review April 2006
ISSN: 1500-1474	Authors : Agnès RANDRIAMANANTSOA, Sigurd HAUS, Gilbert Solfon RANDRIANIRINA
Project number: 285043	Editor: Centre for Intercultural Communication
Completion date: 5.12.2005	Publisher : Misjonshøgskolens forlag

Abstract:

The MLC Organisational Development Project in the Development Sector is now in its second phase (2005-2007). The project consists of three ingredients: 1.To establish a united policy for all the development activities in the MLC. 2.To establish a National Coordination Office for development, and a structure for development on all levels. 3.Give training in development related topics both to professionals and volunteers. This project review takes place within a period during which the Basic Philosophy Document was approved by the MLC, the National Office for Coordination of Development activities is constituted with the staff, the administrative structures are settled and in function and training both on national and synod levels have been carried out. One of the main points in the Policy Document is that development is basically promoted by what is going on on the grassroots' level, what kind of initiatives single persons, farmers and others, church committees on different levels and other organizations take. This review focuses especially on that aspect.

The conclusion was that the impact of the National Office in the synods was very visible. They have guided the synods through a process so that the synods now have their own development plans. Every synod also has a development coordinator and a development committee. And the National Office is still following up the processes in the synods. The review team strongly suggests that these follow-up activities continue.

Key words : Development, Madagascar, Church, MLC, FLM

INTRODUCTION.....	4
PART I	6
Objectives.....	6
Project review team.....	7
The procedure of the project review.	7
Constraints.....	8
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	9
PART II:.....	11
Visits to see development work in three synods	11
Toamasina Regional Synod (SPTm)	11
Visit	11
Reflections after the visits	12
The Avaratrimania Synod (SPAM).....	13
Visit to ANTAOLANOMBY	13
Reflections after the visit.....	13
Visit to AMBOHIMANDROSO	13
Reflections after the visit.....	14
Antananarivo Regional Synod (SPAnta).....	15
Visit	15
Reflections after the visit.....	17
Meeting with the FANILO office.....	17
Meeting with the Project Committee	19
PART III:.....	21
Results	21
Recommendations and Conclusion	23
Termes de référence pour l'évaluation interne de la Coordination Nationale du Secteur de Développement FLM	25

INTRODUCTION

Since 2001, the Malagasy Lutheran Church (MLC) has not striven to implement a *new* process concerning its development activities. In fact, the MLC has mainly received experiences and lessons from its initial development Department instituted in 1982.

The majority of the MLC members involved in development have spent much time in discussing, analyzing and establishing a new process, which wishes to answer, by its diaconal ministry, to Christ's Commandments, and at the same time, to the community Needs. Also, this process would consider the community as the initiator, the actor and the beneficiary of activities. In fact, the local community has to be considered within its human, cultural and spiritual values, as the center of the development: all development activities are from the community and for the community, to the glory of God.

Many different important documents relating to MLC development have been elaborated regarding issues from multiple forums, seminars, workshops, and presentations, especially the Draft Report, the Report of the Basic Philosophy (2002); and the Stage Report entitled "The Role of the Lutheran Church in Madagascar in the Development Sector (2005) for the period 2002 – 2007.

All of those documents tell of the great desire of the MLC and its commitment to go ahead, including facing constraints and obstacles in order to reach the objectives that the church has fixed herself.

The document relating to the philosophy of development adopted by the MLC delimits contextually; in its first chapter, the different sectors, which contain its development activities, namely:

- Health
- Education
- Economical, social and cultural development
- Specialized education and the promotion of taking charge of the hearing and seeing impaired
- Communication.

Certainly, the MLC began social work relating to these sectors since its implantation many years ago with the first missionaries. Numerous activities from the different regions in the highlands give evidence of this initiative. However, in the actual context, a better coordination of the activities of these departments is indisputably necessary.

In fact, the MLC, being a religious entity that is evolving continually, sees the number of its parishes multiplying at a high speed; the same for its different projects. Besides, the policy of Rapid and Viable Development launched by the government, along with consideration of the church as an efficient partner, put the Church within a challenging position, whether regarding a structured or organized plan, capacity, and competence. On the other side, this policy gives her an opportunity to fulfill its own vision.

The MLC organizational development project in the development sector is actually in its second phase (2005-2007). Its basic document planning includes a project review for this year 2006. The project consists of three ingredients:

1. To establish a united policy for all the development activities in the MLC.

2. To establish a national coordination office for development, and a structure for development on all levels.
3. To provide development training in related topics, both to professionals and laymen.

Thus, this project review took place within a period during which:

- The Basic Philosophy Document was already approved and applied by the MLC permanent committee.
- The National Office for coordination of development activities, FANILO, began and set up a staff.
- The administrative structures were settled and functioning.
- Training and seminars, both at national and synod levels, have been carried out since then.

One of the main points in the Policy Document is that development is basically promoted by what is going on at the grassroots' level ; what kind of initiatives are taken individually, by farmers and others, by the church committees at different levels and other organizations. This project review focuses especially on that aspect.

To what extent has the establishment of the FANILO office contributed to activities in line with this vision? The main focus in this project review is the relation between the FANILO office and the synod, at regional, and local levels.

In the first part, the report shows the objectives of the project review, the adopted method method of approach, the constitution of the team, and the duration of the activity.

The second part is reporting the results of visits in three Synods. It includes also the discussions with the Synod Presidents, the FANILO Regional Committees, the Project Committee and the FANILO National Office staff.

The last part of the report gives results, analysis and recommendations; and the conclusion ends the report.

PART I

LET EVERYONE OF US PLEASE HIS NEIGHBOUR FOR HIS GOOD TO EDIFICATION
Rom. 15 : 2

Objectives

The terms of reference (TOR) describe the objectives of this project review. The main questions the project review team are asked to answer are:

- Who does what in the projects, MLC/Partners?
- To what extent is the MLC policy practiced and applied?
- What is the impact of the FANILO work?
- To what extent do we now have a better coordination of development activities?
- To what extent is the coordination office needed?
- How does business management work in the development sector?

The project review team wants to respect the basic philosophy of which the MLC deems as hers. Thus, they adopted a participative approach to assume their tasks.

The meetings were semi-structured. The team established some topics they wanted to cover, but they also wanted to be open to what the participants had in their minds. Every time, the members of the team invited the audience to share their experiences. For a Malagasy person to immediately talk is never an easy task, and more so when others from abroad are present. Yet, the local community, the Synod committee members of FANILO, the Synod President, and the different people responsible participated fully to local visits and took part in discussions. In this way, it lets the team understand the relationship among the development actors at different levels in the MLC.

Discussions were mainly referred to the following points :

- The comprehension of the word “development”
- The activities done in the development area
- The internal organization and the settled (final) objectives
- Encountered problems
- The results
- Local community and church contribution
- The cooperation between other local, national entities, Synod committees of FANILO, National committee of FANILO, other NGO, the Government ;
- The future
- Suggestions

Project review team

The project review team consisted of:

Pastor Gilbert Solofoson RANDIRIANIRINA

He is responsible for the Ankatso District and the Tsarahonenana Parish. His knowledge of the MLC was necessary mainly concerning the general organization and structure as well as his own experiences regarding development work and project review.

Mr Sigurd HAUS

He is a Psychologist researcher, SIK consultant, Committee member of Project development; fully participating in every level of this project the last three years. He has largely contributed to each step of this work through his personal experiences.

Mrs Agnès RASAMIMAMPIANINA

She is a Sociologist. Responsible for IEC activities within Nutrition Project/SALFA; with many years of experience in community-based programs; having participated in the consultative forum, and has contributed to the elaboration of the basic document of the MLC development philosophy. She was a team leader for the project review.

The good fellowship between the members and their compatibility facilitated the project review works, realized within a friendly atmosphere.

This present report was elaborated because of the important contribution of each team member. Different languages were used during the preparation phase, execution and reporting : Malagasy, English and French. The different linguistic and cultural styles of the project review team were considered more as new experiences than as barriers.

The procedure of the project review.

The project review was realized from March 21st to April 04th 2006, and the calendar was established by the FANILO National Office (FNO).

For different reasons, the following Synods were chosen by the FNO to carry out the project review :

- The Toamasina Synod (SPTm)
- The Avaratrimania Synod (SPAM)
- The Antananarivo Synod (SPAnta)

The FNO arranged for local visits and meetings. That allowed the project review team to see for themselves what has been achieved locally, to assess the results, to listen to the local community, to discuss with the District and Synod leaders and the local Development Committee members.

Besides, different documents have been given free to the team members to allow them to have a better knowledge about the FANILO activities, vision, objectives, and organization.

The different Synods visited provided opportunities to meet different activities from one Synod to another. It is the same about the facts and the results. This variation concerns as well the perception, the attitude and the ability of the resources and skills. All of this makes the project review richer and reveals a good choice of places visited.

The FANILO National Coordinator was able to accompany the team project review during all visits. Thus, it allowed the team to have a guide and at the same time a resource person. His assistant joined the team when it visited the SPAM and SPAnta Synods.

This reinforced the access to the information for the entire team. In Toamasina and in Antananarivo, we benefited from the presence of the Synod Presidents who are, respectively, Pastor KOTOSOA Claire and Pastor RANDRIANARIVELO Joseph and other FANILO regional committee members. We also notified the FAFAFI workers such as Mrs RATSIMBA Lantosoa.

Constraints

The project review work began with the visit of the SPTm Synod. As Mr Sigurd came late from Norway the previous day of the departure, the team briefing was held during the trip from Antananarivo to Toamasina. Consequently, the preparation time was not enough for the first trip. On the other hand, the calendar was quite tight. This was a hindrance to visits and encounters regarding time and space, which sometimes resulted in very limited times for visits or meetings.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The MLC organisational development project in the development sector is actually at its second phase (2005-2007); this document planned a project review for this year. The project consists of three ingredients.

- To establish a united policy for all the development activities in the MLC.
- To establish a national coordination office for development (FANILO), and a structure for development on all levels.
- Give training in development related topics both to professionals and volunteers.

The themes mentioned in the terms of reference were:

- Who do what in the projects, MLC/partners?
- To what extent is the MLC policy practiced and applied.
- What is the impact of the work FANILO does?
- To what extent do we now have a better coordination of development activities?
- To what extent is the coordination office needed?
- How does business management (gestion financière) work in the development sector?

This project review was conducted from March 28th to April 5th 2006 by a team of three persons:

- Pastor Gilbert Solofon RANDRIANIRINA from the MLC Tsaraonenana, President of ANKATSO District ;
- Mr Sigurd HAUS, Psychologist/researcher, member of the SIK, Centre for Intercultural Communication, and the Project Committee;
- Mrs Agnès RANDRIAMANANTSOA, sociologist, from Nutrition SALFA Project, leader of the team

Visits in three Synods : SPTm, SPAM, and SPANTA were organised as well as meetings with the FANILO committee, the Synod and District president, churches members, local communities. Other meetings took place also at national level with the members of the Project committee and the FANILO national office.

The first positive results of MLC development are focused on its three objectives :

- the FANILO has its own structure well established and each level has its development committee
- the basic philosophy is actually adopted by the KMSL. It is defined as the process by which the MLC comes to realize the full potential of human life in a context of social justice
- the development national level has its office with the staff and assumes their tasks.

The following points sum up the principal strengths met during the project review :

- The MLC development is for and by the people

Through visited projects and discussions, development begins as an attitude in the hearts and minds of the people. In many areas people are enthusiastic, with motivation and resolved to struggle against the poverty by using their local resources;

- The MLC development involves people in community

Since development means vastly different things to different people, some think it is "money from

outside" or "mane from heaven" but in many cases, people are wakened to the God - given potential, and decide do work together towards common objectives . Each Synod committee includes farmers, teachers, medical staff, churches members, local authorities, and church responsible;

- The MLC development is doing well

The established structure and the philosophy are helpful to guide the full future development activities. The cooperation with other churches, the State, other NGO, Institutions are also fruitful. Each Synod has its own development document that tells us more about their willing and concern to start and or to continue the struggle.

- The MLC development is an integrated process

The main topics of the development are met in any area we visited. The impact of the cooperation between the FAFAFI and the community is especially large and good, leading people in a better way of living. The same is true for SALFA concerning the health and the Education concerning the children.

In other side, some points have to been well considered as:

- the sensitization of the people and the different responsible at each level about the philosophy should be continued and reinforced

- the development activities still need follow up and monitoring from the FANILO national level

- the FANILO synod level needs the help of the national level to put in practise their development planning by providing technical persons and advices for better results

- the reinforcement of the technical skills of the people involved in the development activities.

In summary, we can say the MLC development starts well and till now, it has largely reached its objectives. May the good results encourage and motivate more each of us to go ahead, and keep the candle alight.

PART II:

Visits to see development work in three synods

As said above the following synods were visited:

- The Toamasina Synod (SPTm)
- The Avaratrimania Synod (SPAM)
- The Antananarivo Synod (SPAnta)

These synods were chosen because they have different history about development work. SPAM has a long history and many activities, while SPTm is quite new both as a synod and concerning development work. SPAnta lies between these two.

Toamasina Regional Synod (SPTm)

SPTm is one of the priorities for development activities as decided by FANILO. This Synod was the first to be visited in order to reflect the importance of sensitization coordinated by FANILO.

Two areas have been visited: Anivorano (Ambodimenavozo) and the city of Toamasina where there is alphabetization and SALFA's dispensary.

Visit

The evaluators visited Ambodimenavozo, a hill situated in Anivorano area on March 22nd, 2006. They discussed with ten families composed by 30 individuals. They are migrants who were obliged, in October 2005, to leave their home town where they grew crops for their living, not allowed to bring anything even firewood, because it became a protected area. But there was not any special consideration about them from the government. Thus they were very needy, striving for food, especially for funds generating activities. They were not Christians. Seeing such a situation, the church (FANILO/SPTm) fixed as objective to re-establish every family, having its own field, and supplying them with seeds (maize, rice) of which they are used to plant, then they were given technical advice and nutritional help to enable them to work. In addition, they were asked to plant hot pepper because it is recognized to be a guaranteed generating activity

On March 23rd 2006, we visited the development activities in Toamasina city. We began by the literacy program, implemented by the church that saw many illiterate mothers, so the Pastor made an announcement in three villages surrounding the Lutheran church of Morarano. 28 mothers replied to the call. They are from different denominations (catholic, reformed, Pentecost's), learning how to read and write, wishing to learn handicraft also. There are not only adult students but there are also children whose parents could not afford to pay for their studies, and children from the Toby of Mangarano. There is collaboration between a NGO Saint Gabriel concerning teachers' reward.

There are also push men (78) who attended evening courses, not only general study but learning "traffic rules" and civics which they really need to know for their job. Those who are studying now are of the second class, as the number of those who came for the first one is 66 in 2003.

The same 23rd of March 2006, we visited the SALFA's centres of Toamasina, where everybody comes for care. Though there are other health centres, many come, even those from remote villages of Toamasina region. During epidemical period such as dengue and chikoungounia like lately, the government relied upon SALFA's Dispensary which daily took care of about 200 patients. It does also vaccination. Besides official employees, it has also "friends of health" who does health sensitization and education. There is collaboration between Morarano's Toby, with health checking of the patients every fortnight, the Dispensary is able to give free care for the Toby's patients because it got allowances from the government and other donors.

Still on march 23rd, the project review team had a meeting with the Committee Development of SPTm After the sensitization realized by the National coordinator of FANILO (Mr Noël ANDRIANANDRASANA), the SPTm FANILO's Committee was appointed during the last meeting of the SPTm's Committee on March 2006. They have already elaborated their synod development plan. They have also acquired a yard (25Ha) in Foulpointe and they are looking for an area to build a hospital.

Reflections after the visits

In general, the fact that the Fanilo's Committee Development of SPTm has a good understanding about what real development is, as coordinated by FANILO Headquarter, is an *advantage* for development activities, so it began from the realities and from everyone.

In Anivorano, though there is a lack of knowledge (illiteracy) and the habit of traditional crops, people are eager to welcome technical crops advice. There are still hills vast were crops could be produced. In the case of Toamasina, it is the existence of the support from NGO St Gabriel, women are eager to learn how to read and write and to get involved in handicraft. Pushmen spend time to study for a better future.

We also realized that they embraced all in their work irrespective of their church belongings or religion.

A *weakness* is still the belief that development means grant of funds or support from abroad. This is still rooted in the minds of most people, and they are waiting for support before starting any development activity. All migrants in Anivorano have a common problem for lack of equipment. The actual SALFA dispensary has not enough space for a hospital building.

The Avaratrimania Synod (SPAM)

SPAM is located South of Antananarivo with Antsirabe as its centre. We visited this synod to see how work was done on the grassroots level and to explore if it was possible to see any effects of the FANILO in a synod with well-established development work. This synod has for a long time had many development activities and has also developed a structure to carry them out.

Visit to ANTAOLANOMBY

On Mars 26, one of the team-members, Sigurd Haus, together with the coordinator and his co-worker visited ANTAOLANOMBY, located about 20 kilometres west of Antsirabe.

We met members from the development committee, and we talked especially with Mrs Manana, who has moved to this place two years ago as wife of the pastor. She has been trained as a FAFIFI-animator. In this parish she has initiated many activities like enabling the farmers to produce honey, dry-rice, potatoes and cassava. She goes out in the fields and discusses the agricultural problems with the families. Then groups with at least 7 families are formed and training is given to each group. They have also mobilized the women to repair the road outside the church so that it is possible for lorries to pass.

Reflections after the visit

This rather short visit showed us that it is possible to mobilize in the church and the community with simple means. We feel it is a good example of how it is possible to do something on a grassroots level, and a striking *strength* here is probably that it is the family of the pastor that is involved. The pastor and his wife has a position in the society that enables them to be important ambassadors for good management of natural resources and care for your family and your neighbours.

Visit to AMBOHIMANDROSO

On Mars 28 the team together with the coordinator and his co-worker, visited AMBOHIMANDROSO, a city located in SPAM (the synod with Antsirabe as its centre) about 60 kilometres north of Antsirabe.

First we had a meeting with representatives from different associations and different churches in the district, all on a parish level. The meeting was held in an MLC school. After the meeting we visited some of the activities, the MLC dispensary, a project that used cows and the profit from selling milk as a kind of revolving fund to help poor families, some fields for cultivating seed-plants like eucalyptus, pine and cypress and finally we visited a school in a nearby village (MAHATSINJO).

In this district they have a separate committee for development on district level. On parish level they have one committee for all activities. They feel that this structure makes decision making simpler.

In the meeting we got some information about the *youth association*, with members from a church choir that is involved in cultivating seedlings. This is voluntary work that gives income to the church. People outside the church can ask for advice and work together with them to learn how to produce this plants. This kind of cultivation has a long tradition in this area and they produce a lot of plants (about 150 000 plants each year). This youth association has recently been officially registered. That is because they want to apply for support from the State to start a literacy project. If they get this support, the State will send somebody for sensitisation. Then they plan to select candidates from the church and

send them to Tana for training enabling them to do the literacy training locally. We were also told that the literacy training had a functional approach. They start with the practical problems and challenges and they learn to read and write when they realize that it helps them in their daily life.

The school has both kindergarten and primary and secondary school. All together there are 513 pupils and 17 teachers. Fees, low fees compared to other private schools, finance the school and they also accept that some can't pay. The results are good, 98% pass the exams. They have problems with old buildings and teachers leaving them because other schools pay a higher salary.

Each *Synod* in MLC has recently made a plan for development. We asked if they had been involved. They said that they had not, but that they knew about the plan and their District had been invited to participate in the process.

Two years ago, an animator from the Synod trained them in how to make requests for projects. They send some requests but have so far received no answers. On the synod level there is a special unit who takes care of projects sponsored from outside.

FAFAFI has visited them twice to give advice about the "cow-project".

They also have controllers to control their book-keeping.

They shared with us their *motivation for development*. Their efforts have its source in their faith, and the love of God motivates them to love their neighbours and to contribute in the community.

After the meeting we visited the "cow-project". As said before it is a project that uses cows and the profit from selling milk as a kind of revolving fund to help poor families. An association with members from different churches have four cows. The milk produced is sold and the money earned is used to buy chickens to a group of 3-5 poor families. During one year that amounts to about 120 chickens. After one year the support is given to another group. The members of the association provide food for the cows. The different churches contribute with money so that the association can contribute to different social needs in the society.

Our next stop was the *Dispensary*. It was established in 1996 with three doctors working part-time as volunteers. The buildings were build with support from French Scouts. Now there are 6 employees: doctor, nurse, midwife, bookkeeper, cleaner and guard. They have about 15 consultations each day. They plan to build a new house with a laboratory. They are also involved in preventive medical aid. For example a women group with 12 members does a sensitisation evaluation on AIDS. They get funding from a governmental project. They do a lot of vaccinations (70 each week) and they are also involved in family planning, 3000 women are members in a family planning program.

After the dispensary we visited a family that grew seedlings on their fields. The next stop was a school in MAHATSINJO. They had 88 pupils and 3 teachers. They had recently built a new house for the school. Because the people in that village were very poor it was difficult to run the school. The salary for the teachers were low compared to a public school and a catholic school in the same village.

Reflections after the visit

Concerning the Church's philosophy, we realized that those we met had a clear understanding and what they did had a biblical motivation. We also realized that they embraced all in their work irrespective of their church belongings. So we feel this is in accordance with the basic ideas MLC has

about development. They are also grassroots-oriented and are able to mobilize people in their community, and integrated in the society both on a local, regional and national level. They even have international contacts. Many activities could be labelled sustainable.

Development work in this area (Synod) has a longer history than in many other synods. It is easy to see the committees' contribution to development. We can also see that the synod level has contributed (FAFAFI had an office in the town until one year ago). On the national level the dispensary is linked to SALFA and the schools are linked to the Education Department of MLC. For the team it was not possible to see the direct impact of FANILO on the national level. (The reason for that might also be that no one from the Synod level attended in the meetings.) But the team does not consider it as a weakness because the work is in good progress and is very well organized.

It is not easy to find any *weaknesses* relevant for our purposes based on this visit. But the team saw some signs that worry them. The results this church has accomplished are in many ways based on their ability to mobilize church members and the community. We feel now that there might be a tendency to rely more on support from outside. If that is true, it might cause long-term problems and initiate activities that are not sustainable.

Antananarivo Regional Synod (SPAnta)

Among the three regional synods concerned by the project review, SPAnta is in the middle as the period of realizing the development activity is mentioned and it is also situated in the middle of delimited geographically.

Visit

On March 31st 2006, the team visited the parish of Anosibe Ifanja, district of Miarinarivo; The Synod President Pastor RANDRIANARIVELO Joseph, the pastor responsible of the district, RANDRIANASOLO Jeannot, and the parish pastor attended. Almost all aspects of developments as defined by FANILO Head Quarter were seen, such as education, farming, environment and health.

Five Lutheran schools were established during the last seven years: Anosibe Ifanja, Soamananety, Morafeno, Ampahimanga, Bengitsy. It was done by cooperation between church and community. In Ifanja area, the Lutheran schools have the most numerous pupils. There is the lower cost of scholar fees, so that most parents can afford to pay it. There are good results on official exams, Ampahimanga is an example of this, and every year it has 100 % of success for Primary School Certificate.

The inhabitants live essentially of rice planting and that is the reason why FAFAFI realized sensitization there, educating farmers on technical rice producing, which is the kind of rice that has many offspring or the young rice plant less than 2 months old. At the present time, about 50% of farmers apply this method and they got advantage from it, half of them use already the 8 days young rice plant (2 leaves), some use ramilamina in rice producing, it is also according training from FAFAFI.

If people were only used to planting rice before, now they practice intensive farming methods, from May to November, people are planting tomatoes, onions, peanuts... combined with the use of compost and bone's powder which ameliorate the soil's texture, and that help also to increase the product. People understand this as development implemented by the parish.

Concerning the environmental improvement, the church encouraged the population about it since 1998, teaching about “forest spouse of plant” to protect and to ameliorate the soil’s texture, besides there was reforestation activity to protect the soil’s texture and to help rain coming and to be used as firewood. Actually the inhabitants of Anosibe Ifanja are selling firewood to surroundings villages, before they had to buy it from other places.

As for the Dispensary, it was built by the community with FID (1995), it can be said that there is primary health care service, maternity, TB treatment, Family Planning and there is also a laboratory (November 2001). SALFA made some improvement for the building (2003). The government Health Centre and other non-governmental doctors are sending their physiological samples to the laboratory for analysis.

On March 31st 2006, there was a meeting with development people in Ampizarantany, among them (24) also 4 from Catholic Church. Some were also simple citizen. This is also a place where FAFAFI did sensitization and education work: planting many offspring rice, hole manioc (basket compost), plant with straight lines (contour line), vaccination of cattle, poultry, planting “pink pepper”. There is also the use of clean water.

People are enthusiastic and became themselves sensitizers, being aware of the product increase such as bigger cassava that goes up to 80-100 kg for each root. For intensive rice, a few quantity of 16 kapok of seed produce about 4.5 t. The harvest is abundant and the habitants were encouraged to found an association and elaborate their own project and to cooperate with rural governmental project (PSDR), as a result, the harvest increased very much.

In conclusion, the first responsible of the development in SPAnta, i.e. the Synod president, (Pastor RANDRIANARIVELO Joseph) and the Coordinator (Mrs RATSIMBA Lantsoa Clémence) ended and emphasized that the guarantee of a successful development consists of educating and explaining, and not from outside resources such as important funds.

The project review team also had a meeting with the Synod President and the Coordinator (synod) about their work related to development. The Coordinator is responsible for the development activities in the Synod. She is also responsible for FAFAFI. She travels a lot, preparing sessions that usually last for three days, doing diagnostic work and giving training and advices to single individuals, associations and members of development committees in the church. She relates to all levels in the church. Now she is afraid that there are so many actors involved that want to promote development through organizing different kinds of projects that people are going to be more passive, waiting for a project instead of doing things themselves.

Each District (8 districts) has its own program and she follows up those programs. Right now she is planning a meeting for all the districts the following week.

Training is also organized from the national level. After her visits, she discusses her experiences with the Synod president. He supervises all the development activities; he leads meetings in the synod development committee and participates in training. During his visits to different churches, he always asks about development activities. His opinion is that the activities are very helpful for the people, because the work is done on the grassroot level and because through the Synod level, they also have a possibility to look for solutions in the country or otherwise.

Reflections after the visit

In these visits we saw many results from former sensitisation by FAFIFI. The training done by Antoine Andriambonimihanta (now trainer at FANILO on national level) was mentioned many times and had resulted in a real increase in crops. The work done is now in line with what is done before and the project review team was able to see a very well functioning interaction between the different levels in the church. It was especially interesting to learn how the development coordinator works and the involvement from the Synod president.

A problem now is that people are probably going to be more passive, waiting for a project instead of doing things themselves.

The team also realized the many specific challenges the different groups were engaged in.

In Anosibe Ifanja : concerning health sector: the lack of rooms make the activities difficult as there is no separate building for the treatment of TB patients. The compound needs continuous electricity for medicine storage, caring for sick people at night and water supply, and though they have a generating unit, there is a problem of getting enough fuel. ...

Besides the problems of running the activities, there is also an administrative problem for the church leaders because the role of the church (Synod) and SALFA Headquarter was not clear. The question was: who is above the Dispensary, SALFA or SPAnta?

Problems in connection to the schools: there are many pupils, but few teachers. The main problem is that the schools are not self-financed, and also the fact that the church does not know its role towards the schools. There is a communication problem between the three entities: teachers, parents and church. There are still churches that do not have schools.

In Ampizarantany, there is a lack of drug, good seed storage and fertilizers.

The harvest is good, but access to the market outside of the village or district is very limited. Thus the price is decreasing. One farmer complained: "countrymen are producing rice in abundance which is not eaten. However the Government is importing rice from abroad. Rice is a source of income and it has an impact on the entire life even for the schooling of children.

The inhabitants of Ampizarantany plan to extend their field of product, to pisciculture, bookkeeping and improving and increasing poultry farming. Cooperating for a working capital in order to fight against decreasing of product price.

Meeting with the FANILO office

On March 30th the project review team met the staff in the coordination office. They were Noël Andrianandrasana (National Coordinator and leader of the office), Antoine Andrimbonimihanta (Trainer) and Zoly Ramarolahisoa (Secretary). They also have a driver, Njiva, which did not attend the meeting. The discussion was structured in line with the different aspects of the project: policy, structure and activities (training).

Policy

FANILO explained their thoughts about development to the team. "This is a very important issue, because MLC has had some bad experiences." "Development" used to mean "money coming from abroad" and "imported programs". Our basic idea now is that "development" is what individuals and

groups in the local churches and communities can do to improve their way of living and manage the natural resources in a sustainable way. We have explained these basic ideas to all the synods, but still many do not understand them. We feel that people in the countryside have a better understanding because they generally live by these principles. In the synods all the development coordinators understand these principles, but some of the synod presidents do not and they are also not sure that these principles have full support from the national leadership in MLC.

In general, their experience shows that when people get some experience, they understand what we are aiming at. They know that it works, because they have seen what FAFIFI has done for many years, for example using development committees as a way to promote development. The problem now is that some people mix the ideas of "projects" and "development". They want to use the structure to get projects without involving people first.

FANILO feel they are in good progress in implementing this new policy, but the policy is still a challenge for them. They also feel that the partnership with the State might undermine this policy because the State now focuses very much on requests for projects.

Structure

The National Coordination Office for Development is under the TONIA, the General Secretary. So are the different development departments. The Coordination Office still doesn't have a direct relationship to the departments, but cooperates with them.

There is a National Technical Committee that discusses technical problems where leaders from different departments and development associations participate. Usually about 20 persons attend these meetings that are held twice a year and led by the General Secretary.

The project committee also meets twice a year. It consist of Pastor SAMOELA George -General Secretary (TONIA), Noel Andrianandrasana - National Coordinator, Roselyne Rahanivoson - consultant, Isabelle JENO, Andreas RICHARD and Rep. from NMS (sometimes). The rep. from SIK, who has a follow up function, leads the meetings. This committee discusses more in detail any issues related to the project.

An ad hoc committee was established to help finance the project, but so far their activities have given no results.

At the KMSL level, there is now a commission for development. That means that about 25% (about 40 persons) of those elected to KMSL have sessions where they prepare the development issues before they are discussed in KMSL. The National Coordinator leads these sessions.

The National Coordinator is satisfied with this structure.

The National Coordinator has a good relationship with the synod level, and as we will see under "activities", they cooperate closely. There is now a development coordinator in each synod and they are doing an excellent job. One problem is that they lack resources for example for personal computer, and money to organize seminars and meetings.

The relationship with the different missionary societies is good.

The relationship with the State is also good. Representatives from the state have attended all the planning seminars that have been arranged in all the synods. They have also sponsored some seminars. The National Coordinator is satisfied with the relationship with the State, but also a bit worried, because it seems that the State gives promises that it does not fulfil.

They also have positive contact with FJKM and other churches.

Activities

The activities in this project are mainly different kinds of training and sensitisation. Only a few were mentioned in the meeting. Because of the cooperation with the State, last year a lot of effort was used to carry out planning seminars and finalize synod development plans in each synod. Now all synods except one have finalized their plans. A national plan based upon these plans is also made. Now the FANILO organizes follow-up seminars where 3-5 synods meet to exchange experiences and prioritise their work. In these follow up seminars issues like different farming techniques, women's participation and sustainability are discussed.

Resources and needs

FANILO's experience is that the more training they do, the more they seem to need. They are very busy and often work on Saturdays and Sundays. Antoine uses taxi-bus when he travels and therefore wastes a lot of time. They miss the competence and capacity that Jakob Veia (former coordinator and later consultant) represented. In the office the coordinator has had training in English, the secretary has had training in accounting and is now responsible for the accounting. Antoine has had some computer training. Because the secretary is now responsible for the accounting they feel they need a new secretary. They also feel the need for more space. They have one office for the entire Staff, which is far too little.

On the synod level, they feel the coordinators are doing a good job, but they need more resources. There is a budget for development only in one synod, SPAfi.

Finances

The budgets that they have had until now have been enough to cover their expenses. "Our problem now is the successive reduction in contribution from abroad, which will result in no contribution in 2008 and the years to follow" They have tried to contribute to a local financing by saving per diem money. They have also produced T-shirts to sell. A special association has recently been established called Friends of Development. KMSL has also decided to dedicate one Sunday in August to development work (FANILO Sunday), and the offerings on this day will be used for development work on both national, synod and parish level. As indicated before the ad hoc committee has not come up with any solution so far. All in all they feel the financing situation is very difficult and hope that it is possible to prolong the period of support. The running costs of the FANILO office on national level this year is about 25 mills. AR (about NOK 75 000).

Meeting with the Project Committee

The project review team met the project committee April 3. SAMOELA George, General Secretary in MLC, Roselyne Rahanivoson, Isabelle JENO, RICHARD Andreas, Bjørn Eddy Andersen, RAHANTAHARIVELO Vonilalao Narisoa, and ANDRIANANDRASANA Noel, attended the meeting.

During the session three main topics were discussed: Some aspects about the structure, the cooperation with the State and how to finance FANILO in the future.

A question about the authority of the development committees on a synod level was raised. What kind of authority do they have? The coordinator said that basically it was up to the synods to decide the role of these committees, but it seems that they usually have an advisory role. If a synod wants to make an application for a project sponsored from abroad, the formal procedure is to send the request to the General Secretary. But before that the synods can, and often do ask for help from FANILO and/or the national department that the request is linked to, for example the Department of Education if it is a school.

In the discussion about the cooperation with the State it was underlined that it is important for the church to be a church, but at the same time, support the state's development policy. The problem now is that there is no common platform for the cooperation and therefore it is difficult to achieve lasting agreements about how to cooperate and what kind of support you can foresee. On the grassroot level it is observed that the state's development activities might undermine the creativity and "entrepreneurship" among people because they get to use to financial support. Another problem that was raised in this connection was that in some areas where they have had a real increase in production because of sensitisation and training in new intensive cultivation methods but they don't have access to new markets. This is an area where the church now has started to work.

The third topic was how to finance FANILO in the future. First we have to see the result of this project review. Then possible models and sources for financing were discussed, contributions from the synods, payments for service (such as training), sponsors from abroad or from the State. It was mentioned that KMSL has decided to make one Sunday each year a development day, with offerings to development work. But it was underlined from one of the members in the committee that it is very important to be specific and calculate and include these expenses in the budgeting process, for example in the synods.

PART III:

Results

The presentation of the results will start with a part where we try to answer the questions in the TOR. Then a more general summing up of the results is outlined.

Who does what in the projects, MLC/partners?

The project review team did not go very deeply into this question, but we realized that at least in projects where MLC cooperates with NMS, NMS has a follow-up function done by the NMS-rep. office.

To what extent is the MLC policy practiced and applied.

In our visits we had the opportunity both to ask about the policy and to see for ourselves if it was applied. We stressed two aspects about the policy. The first was the concept of development, and we conclude that the opinion in the church now to a large extent, is that development begins with what can be done on a local level and not with money from outside. But we also saw that this attitude now is challenged. This is not by anyone who wants to promote that development is basically projects financed from abroad or from the State, but by the fact that people are now encouraged to form associations and ask for financial support to a larger extent than before. The second aspect was to find out if the church is promoting development in the community or if they are only doing this inside the church. The answer is clearly that the church is working for the whole community in line with the policy.

What is the impact of the work FANILO does?

The impact of the *National Office* in the synods was very visible. They have guided the synods through a process so that the synods now have their own development plans. Every synod also has a development coordinator and a development committee. And the National Office is still following up the processes in the synods. On the national level we realized that FANILO is involved in many processes in the cooperation with the development departments in MLC, partners from abroad, the State and other cooperation partners. The team has not been able to estimate the impact of these activities, but as far as we see it we believe it has strengthened the capacity and quality of MLC in development activities.

On the synod level we could see the impact of this project down to the grassroots level. That applies mainly to those synods where development activities were not very common and well organized before.

To what extent do we now have a better coordination of development activities?

The activities are now better coordinated. On the national level:

- There is a national plan for development

- There is a technical committee that discusses development activities across departments

- There is a commission on KMSL that prepares development topics for KMSL

- There is an office that has a relationship to the cooperating partners

On the synod level there is a coordinator and a committee that coordinate the activities. On district, parish and church level there are also, to a large extent, committees that coordinate the activities.

To what extent is the Coordination Office needed?

Based on the above answers the office is highly needed. The project review team will especially underline the work they have done related to the synods. We believe that it is important that this work can continue. In the future we suggest that the office should have a broader function than today. (See discussion below)

How does "money management" work in the development sector?

The team did not have the time to go deeply into this question, but we realized that this was and is still seen as a major challenge and this is also the area where a lot of project workers have been trained. That applies also to the FANILO office itself where the secretary has been trained and is now responsible for the budgeting and the accounting in the office.

General description

As outlined above FANILO has contributed to development in different ways. We want to underline their contribution towards the synods that, as said before, has been the main focus in this project review. The FANILO office represents a unique competence in development work and the team evaluates their work towards the synods and through that also to the district, parish and church levels as a way to mobilize for development in the church and the society, which is very important to preserve.

The FANILO team has through their long experience with work on the grassroots level achieved attitudes and skills that are in line with the policy-document. They have the ability to evaluate the psychological effects of different development approaches. They can see when creativity and energy decreases because of too easily accessible financial support. The approach chosen in their work towards the synod level is to a large extent an extension of what for a long time has been done in the FAFAFI program for agricultural development in some synods. So the way of thinking and the methods have proved their relevance for many years. And, as said above, the project review team strongly recommends that this part continues.

FANILO is now organized under the General Secretary and has a consultative role towards other development departments. The team sees no reason to change this formal structure. But there are some new tasks that are not linked only to the development department. They should be placed in the organizational structure, like the (bureaucratic) following up of projects which has so far been done by NMS, coordination of the green program supported by the Norwegian Embassy and also the *over all* follow up of integrated projects in different areas. These integrated (usually rural) development projects have so far been the responsibility for the agricultural or rural development sector. The project review team suggests that those tasks should be included in the FANILO.

But as said above it is important that this is done in a way that doesn't hamper the work towards the synods.

This leads us to the question about how to *finance* the office in the future. As mentioned above some measures have been taken already, but so far the results remain to be seen. The most concrete measure is to have a special Development Sunday in August each year. We have heard no estimates of how much it might bring, but as far as the project review team understand, nobody thinks it will cover more than a minor part of what is needed.

As said above the project review committee suggests that more tasks connected to different kinds of cross-departmental activities might organizationally be placed in the FANILO office. If this solution is chosen, these activities are already financed and so are the follow-up activities connected to them.

But the problem of how to finance the office as such remains and especially the important role the office plays towards the synods. The project review committee has in its discussions with the FANILO office and the project committee strongly recommended that they intensify their effort to finance the office, which they will do. On the other hand it might prove impossible to cover the expenses 100%. The project review committee therefore suggests that MLC and possible donors meet to discuss a solution where a part of the running costs of this office is financially supported from a donor.

Recommendations and Conclusion

”Therefore, my dear brothers, stand firm. Let nothing move you. Always give yourselves fully to the work of the Lord, because you know that your labour in the Lord is not in vain.”

II Cor. 15: 58

1. Continue and intensify the IEC (Information – Education – Communication) on the basic philosophy of the MLC organisational development at all levels and by more different effective means.
2. Continue to assist the Regional Synod Committee of FANILO, especially to get imbibed in development basic philosophy: to know it is not enough, it must be also practiced”.
3. Reinforce the structural ability of Synod Committee of FANILO and the competencies of its members through trainings, seminars, and a better assistance.
4. Keep on carrying the FANILO National Office mission and tasks after the year 2007.
5. Continue to develop FANILO National Office’s status, mission, and tasks as such, within the MLC structure.
6. Implement some new tasks to the office, (bureaucratic) follow-up of projects, coordination of green program, superior follow up of integrated projects.
7. Examine closely the realisation of the local financing.
8. Continue to finance the FANILO National Office by external funding during a given period, meanwhile promoting local financing.

Conclusion

The Malagasy Lutheran Church has chosen its own way for the development work. It will be a development by the Malagasy people for the Malagasy people. Considering all the activities done, FANILO/MLC has made an important step in development activities, challenging the impact of the past experiences as well as the actual socio-economic and cultural environment.

Concretely, this first phase ending on 2007 serves as a basis to the future activities because the real development planned activities start now when each synod has finished discussing and writing its planning document. Again, the FANILO national level will have its significant role to play in helping each FANILO Synod to put its development document in a practical way.

The team members of the project review felt very impressed by the work of the Development Department of the Malagasy Lutheran Church. It is in light of this that we would like to congratulate the National Coordinator FANILO and his staff for their efforts to translate in activities the Malagasy Lutheran Church basic philosophy, for their will and enthusiasm.

Looking to the future, we wouldn't think as optimist or pessimist. We would say we are hopeful. We have seen that hope many times anywhere during the visits of the three Synods while we discussed with the people, leaders, pastors, different responsible and committees.

As the development work is such a long process, requiring the full involvement of each of us at any level, may that hope and our faith help all of us to continue the work and to keep the candle alight.

Termes de référence pour l'évaluation interne de la Coordination Nationale du Secteur de Développement FLM

Type : évaluation à mi-parcours

Contexte :

Le projet devait commencer en 2002 comme un projet de développement organisationnel, au sein de la FLM, qui contribue au renforcement de l'organisation et de la compétence de l'Eglise pour gérer et administrer le Secteur de Développement. Mais les événements politiques de 2002 ont entraîné un retard dans le démarrage qui n'a été effectif qu'en 2003. Dès les premiers temps, le projet a formulé en concertation avec tous les Synodes un document reflétant la philosophie de développement pour avoir une même idée de compréhension sur le « développement » et un résumé des grandes lignes de cette philosophie pour faciliter sa vulgarisation au sein de tous les acteurs du développement.

Une évaluation a été conduite en 2004 pour la poursuite éventuelle du financement pour 2 ans et il y a été fortement recommandé que la Direction Générale de la FLM et le KMSL définissent le positionnement de la Coordination Nationale du Secteur de Développement au sein de l'Eglise pour qu'elle puisse jouer pleinement son rôle fonctionnel.

Durant ces derniers temps, avec la promotion du partenariat Public/Privé, et pour les besoins des institutions du développement de la FLM au sein des Synodes, un Plan de développement National et des Plans de Développement Synodaux (20) sont élaborés et constituent un outil de référence pour la poursuite des actions de développement au sein des Eglises.

But général du projet :

L'objectif général du projet reste le même :

A. Etablir une structure de coordination du secteur de développement au sein de l'ELM.

B. La création d'une philosophie de développement qui servira de base au travail de développement initié par l'ELM.

C. Fortifier les compétences requises du personnel dans le secteur de développement.

Raison de l'Evaluation :

Le Comité du Projet de 03 au 13 octobre 2005 a décidé de faire conduire une évaluation interne du projet.

C'est donc une sorte d'évaluation à mi-parcours qui vise à étudier le progrès et à donner des recommandations pour le reste de la période.

L'objectif de cette évaluation est de :

Répondre à ces questions :

1. Qui fait quoi dans les projets, FLM/Partenaires?
2. Dans quelle mesure, le document de base est-il connu et appliqué?
3. Quels sont les résultats (impact) du travail effectué par FANILO (comités de développement) ?
4. Dans quelle mesure avons nous obtenu une meilleure coordination des activités de développement?
5. Dans quelle mesure le bureau de coordination est-il utile?
6. Comment la gestion financière du secteur de développement fonctionne-t-elle?

Approche :

L'équipe d'évaluation, qui est composée de :

☀ Mme RANDRIAMANANTSOA Agnès, de la SALFA

☀ Mr Sigurd Haus, du SIK

☀ Pasteur RANDRIANIRINA Solofoson Gilbert, de la FLM

- a) révisera les documents relatifs au projet.
- b) visitera avec les Coordinateurs Synodaux de Développement respectifs 2 ou 3 synodes et entreprendra une sélection représentative des centres à visiter
- c) organisera des interviews auprès des groupes cibles et des différents partenaires ou des autorités locales oeuvrant dans le même terrain
- d) entreprendra d'autres activités que l'équipe jugera utiles pour atteindre les objectifs de l'évaluation

Emploi du temps et rapport :

21-23 Mars	Visite FANILO/SPTm
24 Mars	Retour Tananarive
25 Mars	Séminaire sur « Programme Vert » à Antsirabe
27 Mars	Réunion équipe d'évaluateurs à Andohalo Tana
28 Mars	Visite FANILO/Ambohimandroso
30 Mars	Evaluation FANILO au Bureau à Andohalo
31 Mars	Visite FANILO/SPAnta

Une ébauche du rapport sera disponible avant le départ de Mr Sigurd Haus et le rapport final sera prêt avant le KMSL du mois de Mai.

Senter for Interkulturell Kommunikasjon

2006

ISBN: 82-7721-106-6

ISSN: 1500-1474

Misjonshøgskolens forlag

Misjonsveien 34, 4024 Stavanger, Tlf.: 51516247

Fax: 51516253, E-mail: forl@mhs.no